



THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

Edinburgh Research Explorer

'I'm a migrant, but I'm the right sort of migrant'

Citation for published version:

Sang, K & Calvard, T 2019, 'I'm a migrant, but I'm the right sort of migrant': Hegemonic masculinity, whiteness, and intersectional privilege and (dis)advantage in migratory academic careers ', *Gender, Work and Organization*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/gwao.12382>

Digital Object Identifier (DOI):

[10.1111/gwao.12382](https://doi.org/10.1111/gwao.12382)

Link:

[Link to publication record in Edinburgh Research Explorer](#)

Document Version:

Peer reviewed version

Published In:

Gender, Work and Organization

Publisher Rights Statement:

This is the peer reviewed version of the following article: Sang, KJC, Calvard, T. 'I'm a migrant, but I'm the right sort of migrant': Hegemonic masculinity, whiteness, and intersectional privilege and (dis)advantage in migratory academic careers. *Gender Work Organ.* 2019. <https://doi.org/10.1111/gwao.12382>, which has been published in final form at <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/gwao.12382>. This article may be used for non-commercial purposes in accordance with Wiley Terms and Conditions for Self-Archiving.

General rights

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Edinburgh Research Explorer is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

The University of Edinburgh has made every reasonable effort to ensure that Edinburgh Research Explorer content complies with UK legislation. If you believe that the public display of this file breaches copyright please contact openaccess@ed.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.



‘I’m a migrant, but I’m the right sort of migrant’: Hegemonic masculinity, whiteness, and intersectional privilege and (dis)advantage in migratory academic careers

Abstract

Comparatively little attention has been paid to the international careers of many academics, with gender and ethnicity frequently ignored in discussions of migrant academics. Through the lenses of intersectionality, hegemonic masculinity and whiteness, this study explores experiences of migrant academics in Australia and New Zealand, understanding how gender and ethnicity intersect to shape experiences of relative privilege and disadvantage. Qualitative interviews were conducted with 30 academics at various stages of their careers in both Australia and New Zealand. The data reveal the complex patterns of (dis)advantage which characterise the experiences of migrant academics. While some migrant academics may experience disadvantage, for Anglo white male senior academics, considerable privilege is (re)produced through the migration experience. As such, this article suggests migratory experiences can be better understood through the intersectionality of hegemonic masculinity and whiteness to reveal how privilege is maintained.

Keywords: Academics, Ethnicity, Gender, Intersectionality, Masculinity, Skilled Migration, Whiteness

Introduction

Extant literature on skilled migrants highlights mixed experiences, with some studies reporting benefits of international mobility (e.g. Sthal et al., 2002), while others reveal a range of negative experiences, including deskilling, marginalisation and poorer working conditions (Oikelome and Healy, 2007). The complex ways in which gender (especially masculinities), ethnicity and migration intersect remain under-researched.

Academia is one sector where international mobility may be valued (Richardson and Zikic, 2007), with gender and ethnicity potentially intersecting to inform a relatively privileged position within the academy (Sang et al., 2013). Scholars also express concerns with inequalities in relation to the future of university education and traditional academic freedoms around the world, where institutions are taking on an increasingly neoliberal and managerial character (Izak et al., 2017). In particular, not all academics are likely to feel privilege and disadvantage evenly or equally. The intersecting roles of masculinities and whiteness in shaping these circumstances therefore remain relatively under-explored as diverse academics migrate around the globe in search of positive institutional experiences.

This article presents the findings of a qualitative interview study with thirty migrant academics working in Australia and New Zealand. Within the last decade, Australia has seen tens of thousands of skilled migrant professionals arriving to work in the country each year, with numbers relatively balanced by gender, and the largest proportions

arriving from the United Kingdom (UK), India and China (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2015). Skilled migration into New Zealand is broadly similar, albeit with lower overall volume (but still tens of thousands), and significant numbers of migrants from the Philippines and South Africa, as well as India, China and the UK (Ministry of Business, Innovation & Employment, 2018).

By qualitatively investigating academic migration to Australia and New Zealand, this article contributes to the literature in two key ways. First, it adds to our understanding of academic labour, experiences of international mobility, and their intersections with gender and ethnicity. While existing literature has pointed to the heterogeneity of experiences of migrant workers as a result of national origin and gender, this article demonstrates how an intersectional approach, along with theorisation of masculinities and whiteness, can help understand the role gender and ethnicity can have in informing migrants' labour market positions and experiences. Second, by drawing on notions of hegemonic masculinity and whiteness, the research deploys intersectionality to aid better understanding of relative patterns of (dis)advantage within a relatively privileged group: academics. Specifically, the empirical data reveal how privilege can operate within the academic labour market, maintaining the dominance of white Anglo male professors.

The article continues by setting out the existing knowledge on skilled migrants, moving on to consider migrant academics. In order to understand the complex patterns of privilege and disadvantage experienced by migrant academics, the article presents intersectionality as a theoretical framework, and its relationship to whiteness and

masculinities, specifically hegemonic masculinity. After describing the research methods used, the interview findings are presented. The article concludes by considering the implications of the empirical data for how gender and ethnicity intersect to inform the experiences of migrant academics.

Skilled migration

From a critical migration studies perspective, skilled migrants can report a range of difficulties, including poorer working conditions, under-employment (Oikelome and Healy, 2007), and deskilling (Shan, 2013). Furthermore, their experiences are not homogeneous (Syed and Murray, 2009), and are influenced by gender, country of origin and language. From a feminist migration studies perspective, gendered experiences of skilled migrant women may be more difficult due to gendered and racialised inequalities and institutions in the host country and/or workplace (Bastia, 2014). For example, skilled Indian women migrating to New Zealand face under-employment and racialisation through the migration process, where interaction with a new society increased women's awareness of their racial identity (Pio, 2005). Without familial support, skilled migrant women may find themselves restricted to the domestic sphere, an issue not reported by skilled migrant men (Essers et al., 2013).

Drawing on further literature around whiteness and migration it becomes apparent that considerable privilege may be felt by white migrants migrating to predominately white host countries. Whiteness confers degrees of ethnic privilege on migrants according to complex transnational, intersectional and relational experiences still being explored by

emerging research (Samaluk, 2014). It can be defined as “both a resource and a contingent social hierarchy granting differential access to economic, cultural and social capital and intersecting with different social categories that go beyond hegemonic white/non-white paradigms” (Garner, 2006, cited in Samaluk, 2014: 371). In the case of skilled migration, whiteness is constituted by potential transnational, intersectional and postcolonial influences. For instance, white UK migrants, as a result of deliberate migration policies in Australia in the twentieth century, experienced considerable privilege in migration where they easily adapted to the dominant culture, perceived as being close to British culture (Schech and Haggis, 2004).

Extant literature can veer between emphasising positive and negative experiences of skilled migrants. Expatriate adjustment literature contains ideas about both privileged careers, pay and conditions relative to locals, but also disadvantages associated with the disruptions of international mobility (e.g. Rodriguez and Ridgway, 2018; Stahl et al., 2002). However, in critical migration studies, the very category of ‘expatriate’ can be critically problematised as made up of “complex configurations of racialisation, gender, class and nationality, often involving problematic reproductions of the colonial past” (Kunz, 2016: 89). We therefore do not use the term expatriate in this paper, but refer to the participants as migrants.

In sum, further work is required to understand how particular social identities intersect to shape migrants’ intersections and degrees of privilege and disadvantage in their work (Samaluk, 2014). Taking migrant academics as a skilled professional group, the

intersection of whiteness and hegemonic masculinity are considered further below as two influential axes of privilege, combining the lens of critical migration studies with intersectionality to develop a distinct framing and contribution.

Migrant academics

Academics report migrating due to a desire to experience new cultures and travel, to escape work environments in home countries, and to secure higher salaries and further career development (Richardson and McKenna, 2002). For some, internationalisation of higher education manifests at the micro-level, informing their mobility (Johannson and Sliwa, 2014). Despite positive aspects of migration, there is also contrasting evidence of a 'darker side' to an international career, including culture shock (Katrinli and Penbeck, 2010), insecure employment, loss of friends, familial disruption and a sense of isolation (Richardson and Zikic, 2007).

Migrants (Richardson and Zikic, 2007), ethnic minority academics (Bhopal, 2015) and women (Özbilgin and Healy, 2004; Probert, 2005) may experience disadvantage in academic contexts. However, at the intersection of gender and ethnicity, the experiences of migrant women academics are particularly complex and intersectional. Coining the term 'double strangers', Czarniawska and Sevón (2008) suggested that 'foreign' and 'woman' cancelled each other out, leading to greater career success than that of non-foreign women academics. Migrant women professors can enjoy considerable privilege due to their uniquely intersecting identities, circumventing traditional academic norms and utilising familial support to balance work and family (Sang et al., 2013). However, the

gendered experiences of migrant male academics and how masculinities intersect with ethnicity remains unexamined. While whiteness has been identified as a source of privilege within the academy (Ahmed, 2012), its relationship to other identities remains unexplored. Evidently migrant academics do not all share the same experiences of migration, with complex patterns of privilege and disadvantage apparent. However, more work is needed to unpack these intersections.

Intersectionality of gender and ethnicity

Although women and ethnic minority migrant academics may share some common experiences, group unity does not automatically mean group uniformity (Hancock, 2007). With roots in Black Feminist theorising and critical race theory, which challenged the implicit racism in white women's feminist notions of a stable and universal category of 'woman' (Crenshaw, 1999), intersectionality is: *'the idea that social identities such as race, gender and class interact to form qualitatively different meanings and experiences'* (Warner, 2008: 454). Crucially, social group memberships interact with each other to give rise to distinct experiences and manifestations, which cannot be explained by membership to one group alone (Warner, 2008).

Intersectionality is therefore a useful framework for understanding how categories of difference are not experienced uniformly within the workplace (Bowman et al., 2016). For instance, gender, ethnicity and class intersect to inform the experiences of women entrepreneurs, even in the absence of visible markers of difference (Dy et al., 2016). Similarly, Adamson and Johansson (2016) have demonstrated the complexity of the

embodied, gendered notions of what constitutes a credible professional worker. A supposed 'level playing field' at entry level to careers soon gives way to complex intersectional experiences of privilege and penalty as gendered and ethnically salient identity power dynamics take hold (Mooney et al., 2017). In sum, intersectionality allows for a more nuanced understanding of how a category of difference impacts experiences of work and employment, including the skilled migration studied here. As McBride and colleagues (2015) note, an intersectional perspective helps to overcome blurring or erasure of differences within minority groups.

Most intersectional research examines multiple sources of disadvantage, while relative intersectional privilege remains absent in much of the literature. Tatli and Özbilgin (2012) suggest considering the intersections of multiple forms of privilege and disadvantage to more fully account for career and life outcomes. For intersectionality to mobilise its full political potential as an anti-exclusionary tool, it arguably must recognise 'ways in which positions of dominance and subordination work in complex and intersecting ways to constitute subjects' experiences of personhood' (Nash, 2008, p.10).

This article draws on Bastia's (2014) argument that social identities such as gender and 'race' are relationships of systemic power, and those who benefit from these unequal power relations can be seen as 'intersectional subjects' (p.244). Recent work has begun to reveal the usefulness of intersectionality as a lens to reveal privilege as well as oppression. Both Dy et al (2016) and Adamson and Johansson (2016) use intersectionality to understand patterns of advantage and disadvantage within forms of

skilled employment. Specifically, though, there is a need to consider whiteness, and its relationships with other forms of privilege, through an intersectional lens (Levine-Rasky, 2011). This article therefore aims to understand how hegemonic masculinity can be a source of privilege, intersecting with whiteness for migrant academics.

Intersectionality has been applied to studying migrant women, usually as a lens on disadvantage (Bastia, 2014), although occasionally to understand the relative privilege of skilled migrant women (Ria, 2011; Sang et al., 2013; Johansson and Sliwa, 2014). Existing literature has explored career progression, pay and employment experiences of women and migrant academics. However, we still know little of how gender and ethnicity may intersect to affect experiences of migration and academia. Examining how gender and ethnicity intersect for migratory academics helps to understand how intersectional privilege and disadvantage operate to shape their work experiences, providing a more politicised and reflexive emphasis (Collins, 2015). This article therefore also addresses McBride et al.'s (2015) call for greater use of intersectionality to appreciate intragroup differences. Migration is a destabilising experience for all migrants (Leonard, 2008), although gendered masculinities and white ethnicities are powerful intersectional axes liable to shape distinct types of experience further.

Hegemonic masculinity and whiteness

Connell (1987) proposed a *hegemonic masculinity* framework for understanding masculinities and the maintenance of masculine power in organisations, including schools and workplaces (also see Connell and Messerschmidt 2005). Hegemonic masculinity

theory posits a hierarchy of masculinities, with hegemonic masculinity at the apex as a normative, if unachievable, ideal. Other masculinities include complicit, resistant and marginalised. Key to hegemonic masculinity is a social relational understanding of gender, whereby gender is constituted in relation to the *other*. Masculinity is constructed in opposition to femininity. Further elaboration of these constructions takes place through additional relational concepts such as homosociality, whereby men prefer the company of other more similar men (Kanter, 2008). In academia, for example, this may consist of privileged access between white men to influential networks, opportunities and recommendations (Bagilhole and Goode, 2001; van den Brink and Benschop, 2014).

Hegemonic masculinity has been critiqued for not adequately explaining power relations and ignoring the day-to-day practices of masculinities (Demeteriou, 2001). However, when combined with intersectionality and whiteness, as the current study aims to do, hegemonic masculinity can fruitfully be used to understand complex gendered and ethnic relationships in context (Christensen and Jenson, 2014). Whiteness and ethnicity should arguably be considered more specifically to better understand hegemonic masculinity as it intersects with ethnicity in specific contexts (Hearn et al., 2012) - in this case, migrants from diverse home countries residing and working in Australian and New Zealand academia as host country environments. As Christensen and Jenson (2014) argue, in certain national contexts for example Denmark, whiteness is central to hegemonic masculinity, rendering those who are not marked as 'white' and/or male as marginalised. Previous work on masculinity and whiteness in Australian schools, for example, has argued that Whiteness and masculinity are closely tied systems of power and privilege,

with Whiteness often constructed in opposition to Indigenous Australians who are not marked as white, and are unable to access these systems (Hatchell, 2004).

Studies of employment and hegemonic masculinity within Australia and New Zealand are relatively sparse, focusing on only a few aspects of both countries' dominant cultures in relation to whiteness and gender, such as alcohol consumption (Campbell, 2000) and colonial place-naming (Berg and Kearns, 1996). Hegemonic masculinity has been studied in Australian and New Zealand farming, revealing strict gendered divisions of labour with hegemonic masculinity defined specifically in contrast to women's supposed physical weakness (Liepins, 2000). However, work in these settings has generally not taken an intersectional perspective to understand how gender (masculinity) interacts with other social identities such as ethnicity.

Masculinity has also been examined in educational contexts such as schools but remains rarely discussed within academic contexts. Typologies of academic masculinities, building on Connell's (1995) work on hegemonic masculinity, have been identified. Four types of masculinities found in Irish academia were termed *careerist*, *enterprising*, *pure scientific masculinity* and *family-orientated breadwinning* (O'Connor et al., 2015). Despite changes to higher education, the system of male privilege persists in its operations shaping experiences of work and careers (O'Connor et al., 2015).

In sum, it seems that a more nuanced, intersectional theorisation of academic masculinities and degrees of whiteness are important avenues for further enhancing

understandings of how and why these intersections operate to shape migrant academic experiences of privilege and disadvantage. The contribution of this article and study is therefore to understand how white masculine privilege operates through an intersectional lens to shape a range of experiences of migratory academics working in Australia and New Zealand.

Method

Intersectional qualitative research with skilled migrants allows interviewees to relate their migratory experiences in their own words (Syed and Murray, 2009). Data were therefore collected through thirty interviews, covering themes drawn from the literature: description of current role and working patterns, career history, motivations for migration, the experience of migration, perceived impact of migratory status, perceived influence of ethnicity and gender on work experiences, and future career plans. This enabled flexibility between interviews, and for interviewees to raise issues of concern, including explicit discussions about gender, disadvantage and non-work factors. Furthermore, this allowed for a qualitative understanding of lived experiences from an intersectional perspective (Adamson and Johansson 2016; Dy et al., 2016).

Interviews lasted between 50 and 180 minutes. Of the thirty interviews, 28 were digitally recorded and detailed field notes were taken. Two were not recorded, at the request of the interviewee; however, detailed field notes were taken with participants' consent.

Twenty-two took place face-to-face; two via telephone and the remaining six using Skype. Given the dispersed nature of academia in Australia and New Zealand, the use of telephone and Skype enabled a broader range of perspectives to be gathered.

The first author, a White British woman academic, conducted all interviews. As such, they represented both an insider to the community (an academic), and an outsider (non-migrant). Being an insider to a community under study provides some insight into these lived experiences and builds rapport (Johansson and Sliwa, 2016). As a White UK academic, the interviewer shared an insider status with many but not all participants. Furthermore, the interviewer identifies as a woman, and was interviewing both men and women. In line with previous work (Sang et al., 2014), openness of the interviewees to discuss gendered experiences suggests strong rapport, possibly due to partially shared experiences (Johansson and Sliwa, 2014). The second author was a White UK non-migrant academic and a man. Together the two-author team offered some complementarity on gendered readings of the data, but some limiting influence of researcher positionality and bias in terms of identifying all ethnic and migratory sensitivities cannot be ruled out (May, 2012).

All interviewees were provided with a participant information sheet and consent form before the interview. These set out the purpose of the study, right to withdraw, use of digital recording equipment and secure storage of data. In addition, approval from the first author's institution was confirmed, and that data would be used to inform resulting publications. Research ethics were covered again at the start of the interview.

Participants

Respondents were approached through the first author's existing contacts within Australia and New Zealand (advertisements were shared through staff email lists and social media). As such, the process represents convenience sampling. As the purpose of this study was to examine the intersection of gender and migratory status within a particular context, rather than make generalisations, convenience sampling is appropriate (Laidley, 2013). The criteria for participation were first-generation migrant status, working in social sciences within urban centres, and migration more than six months prior to participation. The focus on social sciences allows the study to vary the focus of previous work on academics in Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM) disciplines (e.g. Fangmeng, 2016). Focusing on those employed at urban-based universities avoids conflation with issues faced by rural universities, where faculty often 'fly in, fly out' rather than residing in the area (McKenzie, 2010). Finally, six months after arrival is generally considered an appropriate time point to begin to understand migrants' experiences within a new country (Mahuteau and Junankar, 2008).

The sample size of thirty interviewees is similar or larger than comparable studies with skilled migrants (e.g. Syed and Murray, 2009). A detailed description of participants can be seen in Table 1. Thirteen identified as male, sixteen as female and one as queer with a preference for female pronouns. The majority were in permanent full-time posts, with five occupying roles of 'casual academics' (hourly paid lecturers) and two on research-only contracts. Age ranged from mid-20s to 60s. The majority identified as White, with

twenty-three of the thirty migrating from Europe. The remaining participants identified as Turkish, Arabic, Asian and Jewish. Critically, identifying a significant non-white minority of participants in our sample allowed us to explore and draw out to some extent critical comparisons of intersectional experiences arising from varying degrees of whiteness, masculinity and ethnicity. However, we also acknowledge that migrant diversity is complex and multi-faceted, and future studies and samples may adopt different sampling approaches to achieve different purposes and explore alternative perspectives more deeply.

To protect identities, pseudonyms are provided; and where quotes are used, additional information about participants' job title and home-host countries are provided in brackets. Participants were asked to state their gender and ethnicity on their own terms, which constituted a point of reflexivity around how categories and positions of whiteness are represented, explored further in the findings. In general, we explicitly use 'ethnicity' instead of 'race' throughout the article, given the largely discredited use of the latter as a discriminatory concept (Mason, 2000). However, we mention 'race' on occasion where it has been used by critical literature or participants

[insert table 1 here]

Analysis

Transcripts were subjected to template analysis, which allows for both deductive use of a priori codes from the interview schedule and inductive emergence of codes and themes from the data (King, 2012). Template analysis is particularly useful for understanding the

dynamics of career experiences for marginalised groups, and shared or differing experiences (Wyatt and Silvester, 2015). This is in line with qualitative studies of the working lives of both professionals (Smithson et al., 2004), and migrants (Syed and Murray, 2009). Each transcript was closely read to verify and identify a priori codes drawn from extant literature and themes covered in the interviews, including: reasons for migration, experiences of migration, working patterns, masculinity, privilege and whiteness (e.g. Al Ariss et al., 2014; Johansson and Sliwa, 2014; Sang et al., 2013). Post-hoc codes were developed iteratively alongside a priori codes, and helped to elaborate and refine more particular, emergent experiences of racism, sexism and intersectional privilege or disadvantage, as well as associated work practices, such as networking and promotions.

Findings

Gender, ethnicity and motivations for migration

Reasons for migration varied, reflecting complex relationships between ethnicity and gender, which intersected to inform migration decisions. Women respondents, both white and ethnic minority, cited familial motivations for migrating. In contrast, most male respondents, particularly senior academics, migrated for their own career advancement or for lifestyle reasons.

The majority reported migrating for career purposes, namely, to pursue further study or to take an academic post. However, for some, reasons were more complicated. Emma and Kitty, for example, had migrated to take up an academic post a grade below their UK

positions, to satisfy their male partners' desire to live in Australia. As such, their migration had reduced their relative privilege within academic contexts, with loss of academic status and career opportunities. Kitty had lost her research-active role, moving towards a teaching-only role with limited scope for advancement. For these women, their gender intersected with their migratory status to produce a loss of academic status. The impetus to migrate for a partner's wishes was largely restricted to the women academics and one queer academic. For most of the male academics, their own career progression was the motivator for migration, which for some had resulted in significant familial discord, such as teenage children removed from their friendship networks.

For participants who identified as white, lifestyle and climate were cited as important factors in migration decisions. For example, Martin, a white British male professor, cited the sporting culture as a reason for his move to Australia. While lifestyle was not cited by all respondents, it was cited by many male and female white participants as a motivator to remain in either Australia or New Zealand.

Political concerns emerged as a push factor. Kamal, a male Jordanian casual academic (hourly-paid lecturer), reported a strong desire to leave his country of birth (as opposed to a strong desire to move to Australia). Kamal cited political reasons for his move, namely his desire for free speech and to live somewhere with more equal gender relations. Several white British respondents also reported a desire to leave British academia, citing increasing audit cultures and dissatisfaction with UK academic politics.

Intersectional influences on migrant academic networks and assimilation

Gender and ethnicity intersected to inform the process of migrants' settling into social and professional life in host countries. For UK and North American migrants, social networks were facilitated by a shared language, identifying a source of privilege for these respondents. For the white academics who had migrated to Australia from the UK, Canada, New Zealand and Germany, the period of adjustment to their host countries' culture was described as relatively rapid. Few difficulties were reported, and less felt need to assimilate was expressed through assumed degrees of whiteness, supremacy and privilege. Lynn, a UK Professor now in NZ, articulated, '*there are a lot of expats [in New Zealand] and there is the British and Scottish cultural heritage*'. Despite this apparent awareness of relative privilege in settling in, participants did not reflect on the colonial origins of both English as the main language in both countries.

For migrants not from North American or the UK, the transition was not felt to be so easy, with disadvantage stemming from exclusion from the systems of power and domination of whiteness. As Kamal, Riza and Raj reflected, unlike UK or North American migrants, they had to adjust to the local (white) culture, although they felt they had achieved this. Both Riza (male, lecturer, Thailand-Australia) and Raj (male, senior lecturer, India-Australia) noted the importance of alcohol to social networks in Australia, which they reported having to adjust to:

'I try to accept the local culture, that was my idea. Some lifestyles are different. Drunkenness is a serious issue during the weekend.' (Riza, male, lecturer, Thailand-Australia). This was not identified as an issue by any of the female or white male

participants, despite previous research suggesting the drinking culture in Australia is gendered in that alcohol is often associated with Australian masculinity.

Kamal, a Jordanian academic working in Australia, reported making a concerted effort to adjust to Australian culture:

'I lived with my cousin and three other Jordanian students. I didn't want to stay with them for long, I said I want to live with people from other cultures; I need to learn the language and culture. I was with him [cousin] for two months, and they showed me around, and then I found a place near [employer name] with an English guy, and a Scottish guy, and a Brazilian.'

For the ethnic minority male academics in the study, their migratory experience was thus complicated by a felt need to adjust to local cultures associated with greater levels of whiteness (e.g. Australian). This was not the case for white (specifically white British) male or female respondents, whose settling in periods were often much smoother. When all participants referred to local cultures it was clear they were referring to dominant white academic cultures, rather than Indigenous or Maori cultures.

For all respondents, professional networks were identified as key to their academic careers, due to associated benefits of links with industry for securing funding and informal mentoring. Several respondents felt international scholars were privileged within recruitment processes at universities in both Australia and New Zealand. Cathy (female, head of group, UK (Scotland)-New Zealand) stated that there was an *'active policy to employ international academics in some situations. The government asks universities to maintain international links'*. Respondents felt that the apparent preference was in large

part due to international networks that such scholars would bring with them. Although participants were not explicit in what they meant by 'international' academics, the advantages of an academic status were not reported by scholars from non-Western countries, (e.g. Jordan and Turkey), again showing the operation of whiteness in shaping privileged experiences.

For respondents from the UK, Europe and North America, maintaining professional networks in home countries was considered very important, although difficult due to distance and time differences. Key to maintaining these networks was attendance at international conferences and use of technologies, such as Skype and social media, for maintaining links with international networks. Importantly, social media was useful for maintaining networks rather than establishing them. For academics from the UK, Europe and North America, maintaining their existing academic networks in those countries was reported as particularly valuable. Specifically, white male UK professors recalled very strong professional networks, which had facilitated their migration and their academic careers.

David (male, professor, UK-New Zealand) stated that these networks are key due to the dominant cultures within publishing, and that academics in New Zealand may struggle to publish data collected in that country, due to a perceived lack of interest in high-ranking journals. For David, maintaining links to the UK enabled him to collect data which he felt was more likely to be published in top-tier journals, thus maintaining a more privileged research profile.

Masculinities, whiteness and migratory career progression

All participants in permanent academic posts clearly articulated what they felt was necessary for promotion; specifically, demonstrating excellence in teaching, research and service. Generally, respondents felt that promotion criteria were clearly articulated. However, when recalling his experience of promotion from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer, Raj felt *'there were no criteria, it's all political'*. During the interview Raj showed the interviewer the staff pages of his school and those of senior management, identifying that all of the senior people were 'white'. He went on to explain that he felt there were no set promotion criteria rather promotions were made based on those staff who were marked as 'white' and were more able to engage in the politics of departmental life. Raj's statement suggests that promotion criteria were more straightforward for some academics than others, and in this case they were clearer for those who are marked as 'white' and are thus able to benefit from the systems of whiteness that Raj felt existed in his Australian university.

Gender was identified by women academics as an important factor for career progression, and respondents expressed mixed attitudes regarding gender bias within Australian and New Zealand academia. Several women felt that academic cultures in both were characterised by masculine working norms and masculine privilege. Within her career in Australia, Karen (associate professor, NZ-Australia) identified *'overt sexism...as my primary discriminatory experience'*. Reflecting across her career, Janet (professor, UK-New Zealand) felt that *'discrimination against women [was] very strong'*. Karen, and

another participant, Julia, had spent most of their careers outside of their country of birth. Umut, who had worked as an academic in Turkey, the USA and Australia felt that within Australia there was *'male dominance...the female academic has to be twice as good to be acknowledged at the same level...a dominant woman may go through [promotion] but introvert or silent [women] you won't get anywhere. You have to fight. It's a boy's club'*.

In contrast, women participants from the UK felt that Australia and New Zealand reported less gender discrimination against women, potentially due to being marked as white and greater access to the systems and structures of whiteness thus shaping more privileged experiences. Laura (female, senior lecturer, UK-Australia) was newer to Australia and felt that gender was *'more salient in [name of previous UK institution] a real boys' club'*, although she also felt that the *'performance of professionalism [is] very masculine, being seen at the office'*.

Cathy (female, senior lecturer, UK (Scotland)-New Zealand) felt that her host country was more open to women in senior positions than the UK:

'New Zealand had a woman prime minister, there are women in high places. There's still a glass ceiling, but it's less tradition-based, less barriers for women to break through. It's based on merit.'

Women who were newer to their host country, and in more senior positions, held even more positive views on gender equality in universities in Australia and New Zealand, as compared to their home country. In part, this may be attributable to familial support. For respondents with children, career progression was combined with a partner who worked part-time or did not have a paid job. Karen, Janet and Laura attributed their career

progression in part to their male partners' willingness to undertake more responsibilities. In contrast, none of the male participants with children reflected on their female partner's role in their career progression, suggesting the influence of hegemonic masculinity, whereby masculine privilege (and female partner's domestic and supportive role) is normalised the extent that is not reflected upon, and a lack of awareness of associated privilege as a male breadwinner figure.

Gender and ethnicity thus intersected to influence academic careers, particularly regarding the benefits of academic mentors. The white male UK/European respondents reported benefits of mentors most clearly, with all white UK male senior academics having been headhunted, by other men, for their current positions. Edwin (senior lecturer, Netherlands-New Zealand) had been headhunted via a former mentor. Harry (professor, UK-Australia) reflected at length on the importance of his networks and mentor to his academic career. Harry secured each of his academic posts and promotions without having to apply, after being recommended or headhunted by mentors or members of his extensive networks. He further referred to the importance of his mentors' advocacy to his career. The move to Australia was the result of a personal contact from a former mentor:

'That is another thing that meant the whole thing and prospect of making a major move was something where you could place some reliance on it, a long association with somebody. You are comfortable with them, as you know they have the same background as you. Bill was working as a practice person, like me at the time, when we initially knew each other. He switched sideways into the academic world as well.'

This group is run in a way that is comfortable for me as well. I knew that would be the case.'

Harry's quote illustrates the importance of mentors, and the importance of those who have 'the same background as you', indicating that mentor-mentee and network relationships are comprised of similar people. Specifically, these white male UK academics were able to mobilise a hegemonic masculine privilege that white UK female academics were not. Key to these networks was the *homosociality* between white male, UK/European academics who maintained strong networks with other white male UK/European academics. All white male senior academics from the UK in the sample recalled that they had been headhunted for their current position by other white male mentors. One of the white male UK Professors reported that he had never applied for a job or promotion, as all had been secured via networks and offers from other white male senior UK academics. However, this apparent privilege was not reflected on further by these participants.

For these white male UK professors, the benefits of networks extended beyond recruitment and promotion. Martin (professor, UK-Australia) was able to mobilise his industrial and academic networks to successfully apply for research funding, a key aspect of his career success. Harry also reported similar ease of access to funding networks on his arrival from the UK to Australia. Notably, these mentors and networks were other white men. However, when asked to reflect on the importance of mentors and networks to their academic careers, each of these men stated that they were unimportant and their success was the result of their own hard work or luck:

'[Success was] *Nothing to do with networks. It is absolutely a lottery*' (Martin, male, Professor, Australia).

In contrast, the white UK women in the study demonstrated some reflexivity in relation to their relatively privileged position. The lack of reflexivity on behalf of the white male professors in the study was thus exhibited while recounting the importance of white, masculine others (mentors, networks) to privileged aspects of their careers (e.g. recruitment), when asked directly. In addition, there was a tension between narratives of strong networks as vital for securing positions and promotions, and yet simultaneously narrating luck or personal ability as the main reason for career success.

Masculinities, whiteness and migratory privilege

Academics explicitly discussed whiteness and ethnic (dis)advantage during the interviews. Some white women academics migrating to New Zealand did report some difficulties acculturating. For example, Cathy commented at length on her period of adjustment to Maori culture, despite what Cathy felt were similarities with Scottish clan culture. However, such similarities may only be superficial, hence the difficulty adjusting reported by Cathy.

White men, however, typically reported ease in settling in and maintaining existing networks. Finally, ethnic minority participants recalled significant difficulties in their initial settling-in periods and developing social networks. Cain and Raj felt this was linked to what they identified as explicit racism within Australian culture. Raj (senior lecturer, India-Australia) recalled being the victim of a racially-motivated, physical assault when he was

a PhD student. Within academia, Raj felt that racism was not *'in your face'*, but *'behind your face'*, citing the lack of ethnic minority academics at senior levels within his institution. As such, the data suggests that privileges associated with masculinity were not evenly felt by all the men in the study, rather it was predominately felt by white men, suggesting the intersectional operation of hegemonic masculinity and whiteness in shaping the highest levels of privilege.

Whiteness (specifically whether participants identified as 'white' or were marked white) and masculinity varied in how disadvantage that was felt and reported. Cain (hourly-paid lecturer, Canada-Australia) said *'you'd have to be racist not to notice the racism'* and went on to explain that he often felt like *'Cain the Jew'*:

[I] had two experiences meeting people. I am Jewish, and two people when I saw them would find a way to round the conversation to something Jewish. Nothing offensive or threatening, but after a while it was still clear I was 'Cain the Jew' and I was not a big fan of that.'

Cain further explained his experiences at immigration offices in Australia:

'When I was applying for my de facto visa, I went to the immigration office, and saw a South Asian family, and another Asian family sat there crying, and I thought it would be terrible. We were expecting it to be bad, but they did it and said 'see you later'. It is great being white, but not for them. I am very aware of white privilege.'

Cain's experience thus reveals tensions in the relative, shifting privilege of whiteness for participants, with visual or marked whiteness privileged in migration processes, while also experiencing uncomfortable situations at other times, associated with being Jewish. As

such Cain's experience demonstrates that being marked white and male, was insufficient to fully benefit from standing at the intersection of masculinity and whiteness. A particular form of whiteness was seen to be privileged, one which was not identified explicitly by other white male participants.

Several white UK and North American migrants, men and women, reflected explicitly on what Cain identified as his '*white privilege*'. Cain and Laura recalled similar experiences of navigating the Australian immigration system. Laura (senior lecturer, UK-Australia) stated '*I'm white and that brings with it significant advantage*', specifically what she called '*Anglo privilege*', citing how her '*educational privilege*' facilitated her understanding of and ability to understand immigration paperwork. Cain recalled visiting the immigration office and his perception that as a white male he was called to the front of the queue, while Asian migrants were pushed to the back of the queue and treated badly by those working in the office. Chris reflected '*I'm a migrant, but I'm the right sort of migrant*' (lecturer, UK-Australia). Emma called herself an '*invisible migrant, an English migrant coming to an Anglo-White colony*' (lecturer, UK-Australia). Specifically, Laura and Emma reflected not just on their whiteness, but how being white and from the UK resulted in significant privilege. Despite being relatively marginalised in academia due their gender, they felt their whiteness nonetheless conferred significant privilege.

So-called white privilege was not uniform and was tied to particular forms of whiteness. Native English speakers felt that this facilitated their migration experience, although Lynn (professor, UK (Scotland)-NZ) felt that her Scottish accent was a '*social marker*' of

difference. As a German, Maren (hourly-paid lecturer, Germany-Australia) stated that as a *'non-native speaker I'm not trusted to speak English'*. Reflections on the relative privilege of being a white migrant were thus expressed by women participants and ethnic minority male participants. Similar reflections were not reported by white male professors.

Tony, a recently retired academic in his sixties (Research fellow, UK-Australia), reported experiences which reflected that being a white male did not uniformly confer privilege. His academic career was characterised by short-term research contracts regularly available to him through his affiliation with a research centre. However, Tony also lived with disability (Asperger Syndrome) and serious health issues. Due to his health condition and difficulties with social interactions linked to being autistic, he lost his employment contract and was moved onto an unpaid honorary role. This had occurred when a new manager had taken over the research centre, and Tony was forced to take early retirement. As such, for some, other intersecting identities resulted in disadvantage as they strayed from hegemonic masculine ideals. For this disabled man, he was not able to adhere to working patterns and practices which were expected of him. He was therefore not able to model an accepted or dominant form of masculinity, and subsequently lost his paid employment. The data suggests then, that for this white UK male, his privilege was contingent on being able to work long hours and engage in forms of social interaction which his health and 'impairment' prohibited.

Other participants reflected on how their ethnicity had affected their working experiences and careers, particularly in relation to working with Indigenous or Maori students and

research participants. Working with indigenous communities posed challenges. Karen (part-time senior lecturer, NZ-Australia) reflected on an awareness of white privilege for white migrants to Australia, around the nuances involved in working with indigenous Australians. *'It brought a bit of rapid humility into my life experience, and I had to shut up in a way that I never had to do before'*. Karen had not worked with Maori people in New Zealand prior to starting her academic career in Australia, which may explain why she did not reflect on the relationships between white migrants and Maori people in her home country. Cathy (senior lecturer, UK (Scotland)-New Zealand), reflected upon experiencing a similar learning curve in terms of Maori culture:

I learned about cultural differences. The Maori culture was a very steep learning curve here. There are a lot of similarities between the Scots and the Maori New Zealanders. They have been dominated by another culture. By virtue of my white skin, I am also automatically viewed to be racist, and I found that I was in ways that I was not aware of, that I wasn't conscious of. I just hadn't seen it from that perspective before. The racial aspect of the culture and academic aspect are two very strong areas of learning for me.

Both Cathy and Karen thus draw attention to a facet of ethnic privilege in being a white migrant, working in Australia and New Zealand. Working with indigenous Australians and Maori colleagues/students increased their awareness of their own ethnicity and their relative privilege.

Discussion and conclusion

The data presented here has revealed that gender and ethnicity intersect in complex ways to confer patterns of white and/or (hegemonic) masculine privilege and disadvantage on migrant academics in Australia and New Zealand. Previous work has suggested that migration is a destabilising experience for all migrants (Leonard, 2008) or can confer considerable advantage (Sang et al., 2013). However, what this article suggests is that some experience specific disruptions, while white male westerner (UK, European, North American) academics experience considerable benefit and stability from migrating.

Particularly for the white male participants, career and lifestyle were important motivators for migration. For women, and one ethnic minority man, familial concerns motivated migration. The data thus suggests that gender and ethnicity intersect to inform the impetus for migration, and the relative privileges or disadvantages arising in migratory work experiences. For several white women participants, migrating to satisfy a partner's desire to move to Australia or New Zealand resulted in a downward career step. This links back to critical and feminist migration studies reviewed earlier in the article, which have revealed the gendered power dynamics inherent in who decides to migrate and why (Lawson, 1998), even for relatively privileged, skilled groups of migrants.

Previous intersectional analyses have showed rapid career advancement for women migrant academics (Sang et al., 2013). From an intersectional perspective, however, it becomes apparent that not all migrant academics feel privilege evenly. Specifically, migrant ethnicity and gender can intersect for women, resulting in career regression and relatively lower pay. For ethnic minority men, their masculine privilege appeared to at

least partly be offset by the marginalisation arising from their ethnic minority status and lesser degrees of whiteness, both within academia and broader Australian or New Zealand cultures. As such they experienced a racialisation in the migration process identified in previous work (Pio, 2005). There were few ethnic minority women in the current study, so it was not possible to determine the gendered nature of this. Future work should attend to this gap.

Several white participants explicitly discussed how they felt the intersection of their ethnicity and migrant status conferred privilege. This level of reflexivity is perhaps not surprising given that the participants are social sciences academics, many with specific expertise in aspects of social (in)-justice. Thus both white people and those of colour lead lives in which they are raced (Frankenberg, 1993). Racialization can also be taken to mean that a migratory individual moves from a subject not having 'race' consciousness to one that does, with '*recognition of the societal and individual implications of this*' (Ifedi, 2010, no page number). For some of the participants in the current study, migration to Australia resulted in an increased awareness of their own whiteness. Some academics became aware of their own ethnic identity and were able to articulate some understanding of the privileges conferred. However, most white western men in the current study did not appear aware of either their privilege or their racial identity.

This study suggests whiteness shapes the experiences of migrant academics and that intersectional analyses of migrant ethnicity and gender can add to our understanding of patterns of disadvantage and privilege within the academy. The institutional whiteness

and its privileges identified by Ahmed (2012), may travel with migrant academics from the UK to Australia or New Zealand. However, participants did not reflect on the colonial violence or history which had provided this relative privilege in the post-colonial contexts of Australia and New Zealand. Specifically, while some participants reflected on the privilege of a shared language with their host countries, there was no further reflection on the dominance of English coming at the expense of Indigenous languages or the Maori language (Nicholls, 2005). As such, the privilege of whiteness must be understood in the context of the UK and the English language's relationship with Australia and New Zealand as former colonies.

White male participants were less likely to reflect on either their racial or gender privilege. In fact, none of the white UK male academics studied reflected on their ethnic, linguistic or gendered privileges. Their dominant position in both academia and society remained unexamined for them; indeed, they appeared unaware of their privileged positions. This understood here in terms of how whiteness and hegemonic masculinity act as systemic relationships of power governing intersections of ethnicity and gender (Bastia, 2014). Specifically, the hegemonic nature of a white male Anglo identity or presentation, the dominance of which is normalised within the contexts studies here, hence it does not need to be reflected upon. As DiAngelo (2018) notes, white people, by virtue of white dominance in Western societies such as the USA, are racially illiterate and as such are not aware of complex and nuanced ways in which racism pervades societies. Coupled with many men's inability to see themselves as gendered or benefitting from system gendered privilege (Kimmel, 2007) we may expect white men to not see their privilege.

However, and in line with theorisations of hegemonic masculinity in relation to lower-status masculinities, this was not evenly felt by all the white men in the study (e.g. Cain's experiences with anti-semitism, and Tony's job loss as a result of his disability). Dominance and privilege related to ethnicity and/or gender can go unnoticed due to its being accepted as 'natural', particularly within the Australian and New Zealand contexts (e.g. Wadham, 2004). That those men who were marked as white (i.e. had white skin), but due to their ethnicity were marginalised masculinities, for example Cain were those to reflect on the dominance of 'whiteness' reflects the hegemonic and mutually reinforcing nature of systems of whiteness and masculinity. Specifically, white Anglo or western privilege associated with language and perceived shared culture is evident. Both Australia and New Zealand are former British colonies and retain close political and economic ties with the UK, and other western nations have white, imperial and colonial legacies with similar resonances. However, most of the white participants, especially the white UK men, did more than not recognise their privilege through whiteness, but also did not reflect on the disadvantaged exclusion that occurs through their relative inclusion. Thus reflections on whiteness, masculinities and privilege emerge only in some instances, and future research may need to go beyond interview accounts taken at face value to more critically interrogate levels of denial, dissonance and self-awareness at play.

The concept of Anglo privilege is particularly salient in Australia and New Zealand, with Anglo or Anglo-Celtic ethnicities seen as the dominant group (Forrest and Dunn, 2006). Schech and Haggis (2004) have also suggested that UK migrants experience

considerable privilege within Australia. The current findings are consistent in showing that white UK migrants do settle easily in Australia. Here, Ahmed's (2012) concept of institutional whiteness is helpful for revealing how white privilege is maintained in academic careers and is extended to cover intersectional migration experiences. Some participants were able to reflexively point to clear examples of where their whiteness was beneficial. While white male professors did not reflect on their white masculine privilege, careers were privileged through headhunting, active mentoring and promotions. The white male privilege they seemed to have experienced had itself migrated with them, indicating the operation of intersectional relationships of privilege (Levine-Rasky, 2011). Specifically whiteness (particularly British whiteness) and hegemonic masculinity intersected to confer considerable privilege. The institutional whiteness of academia thus seemingly operates similarly within Australian and New Zealand academia to privilege certain forms of whiteness. Nevertheless, future research may be needed to further tease out ethnic similarities and differences - across imperial-indigenous power relations, for example - in different migratory academic settings.

The data presented also shows Anglo privilege does not exist distinctly from other forms of hegemony. An intersectional lens enables us to see the importance of other identities, including gender and masculinities. Disability may counter some of the privileges reported by Anglo white male academics and requires further intersectional research to understand these dynamics. In the current study, despite being a white UK man, Tony's experiences point to the potential difficulties experienced as a disabled academic, particularly as compounded by precarious contracts. Evidence from other skilled sectors suggests

disability may trouble men's dominance in the workplace (Sang et al., 2016), suggesting disabilities intersect with masculinities to shape the careers of skilled migratory workers.

No women or ethnic minority men in the current study were able to point to clear career benefits of being a migrant, despite some suggestion that universities in Australia and New Zealand prefer to hire overseas scholars. Some women's assertions that Australia and New Zealand may be less gender-biased than the UK could be contested with statistics showing that women's promotions to senior levels within higher education are almost identical (HESA, 2015; New Zealand Commission on Human Rights, 2012). These reflections may be the result of the women's relative seniority in the current sample.

Yet for certain white male migrant academics, mentoring by other white male academics, a form of homosociality (Connell and Messerschmidt, 2005), appeared to be an important consideration, despite a lack of reflexivity in some cases. For Anglo white male professors, their privilege remained relatively constant, travelling with them from their country of origin to Australia and New Zealand. This suggests that changes in context may not always result only in shifting patterns of (dis)advantage (e.g. Adamson and Johanssen, 2016). Those men who did reflect on their privileges did so through a reference to their whiteness rather than their gender. It is notable that much of the extant literature on gender in academic careers has focused on women, leaving men as an unexamined group, pointing to a need for greater understanding of how academic men are gendered too.

There is clear benefit in rendering visible the masculinities performed by male academics and how it affects their careers. For senior white UK male participants, hegemonic masculinities and masculine privilege operated through male-dominated homosocial networks, ease of migration experiences and access to resources such as research funding. Notably, those white men who were less 'white' Anglo or ethnic minority male academics did not report such benefits from homosocial networking and as such were not able to attain hegemonic masculinity, but instead could be seen to occupy forms of marginalised masculinities, suggesting intersectional analyses of gender and ethnicity benefit from also drawing on related theoretical lenses such as hegemonic masculinity (Connell and Messerschmidt, 2005). This can reveal how a hierarchy of masculinities is formed and how this maintains the current gender order, which privileges all men over women, while providing greater privilege for those (white, senior, able-bodied) men who are able to perform their gender along hegemonic lines. The data did not reveal that any men were actively resisting hegemonic notions of masculinity or 'whiteness', although due to the exclusion from systems of power and domination it would not straightforward to say they were occupying complicit masculinities either. More research is required to understand how men and those who do masculinities resist systems of power and domination in the workplace.

The data presented here has demonstrated that the experiences of migrant academics cannot be understood without considering how gender and ethnicity intersect. More precisely, the experiences of skilled migrant workers, in this case academics, would only be partially understood if gender, ethnicity and migration were analysed in isolation. The

data shows that the highly privileged experiences of white male western academics needs to be understood as an intersection of privilege across multiple intersecting relationships of power (Bastia, 2014), namely (hegemonic) masculinity and whiteness, with relative degrees of the former and latter depending on specific national and ethnic backgrounds.

Revealing these complex interactions has been possible by mapping combining intersectionality with Connell's framework of hegemonic masculinities. Doing so has allowed for an analysis of the relationships of power between whiteness, masculinity and migration between different national contexts. While this article has provided valuable insight into migrants' career experiences, the research also opens other avenues for further critical research on migrants' intersecting identities. One important limitation of the current study is the relatively homogenous sample. Although there was some diversity in terms of gender and ethnicity, there was insufficient data to understand in detail all possible experiences of these marginalised groups. The data suggests that much of the privilege was felt by more senior male academics, while more junior men and women did not share such experiences. Class, seniority and age could therefore be explored further through future research, as they are also likely to relate to the career stages and opportunities encountered by migratory academics.

The Australian Government (2017) collects data on higher education staff by gender, but equivalent data for sexuality and ethnicity are not available. Data on international (non-White) students' experiences suggests that there are difficulties with language, settling in and racism (Wang et al., 2015). Further work is required to understand particular

experiences of a significant minority in the current sample, non-White migrant academics within Australian and New Zealand universities, given the potential specificities of understandings of ethnicity within these national contexts. A potentially fruitful area of future research would be ethnic minority UK academics who migrate for career purposes, particularly given evidence that many seek employment outside of the UK (Shepherd, 2011). Doing so will allow for a more fine-grained analysis of Anglo privilege, degrees and intersections of whiteness.

In conclusion, this article has combined intersectionality, hegemonic masculinity and whiteness into a novel theoretical framework for critically understanding the experiences of a relatively privileged group of migrants. Variations in masculinities and whiteness are valuable lenses for revealing intersectionally gendered and ethnic patterns of (dis)advantage and privilege. The experiences of skilled migrants cannot be adequately conceptualised by looking at gender or ethnicity separately. High levels of privilege appear rooted in the intersection of gender (masculinity) and ethnicity (whiteness), as well as nationality (UK and other Anglo, western nations with imperial, colonial pasts). That is not to say other men did not experience or report some privilege, or women are uniformly disadvantaged. However, using an intersectional lens in this way has thus revealed how a particular form of privilege operates within the academy, while also revealing where other different and relative forms of (dis)advantage are present.

References

Adamson, M., & Johansson, M. (2016). Compositions of professionalism in counselling work: An embodied and embedded intersectionality framework. *Human Relations*, 69(12), 2201-2223.

Ahmed, S. (2012). *On being included: Racism and diversity in institutional life*. Duke University Press, North Carolina, USA.

Al Ariss, A., Özbilgin, M., Tatli, A. and April, K. (2014) Tackling whiteness in organizations and management. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 29(4): 362-369.

Australian Bureau of Statistics (2015, 3 December). *Skilled Migrants*. Online report. Retrieved from <http://www.abs.gov.au/ausstats/abs@.nsf/Previousproducts/3418.0Main%20Features72010-11?opendocument&tabname=Summary&prodno=3418.0&issue=2010-11&num=&view=>

Australian Government (2017, 15 December). *Department of Education and Training Staff Numbers*. Online report. Retrieved from <https://docs.education.gov.au/node/46141>

Bagilhole, B., & Goode, J. (2001). The contradiction of the myth of individual merit, and the reality of a patriarchal support system in academic careers: A feminist investigation. *European Journal of Women's Studies*, 8(2), 161-180.

Berg, L. D., & Kearns, R. A. (1996). Naming as norming: 'race', gender, and the identity politics of naming places in Aotearoa/New Zealand. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 14(1), 99-122.

Bhopal, K. (2015). The experiences of black and minority ethnic academics: Multiple identities and career progression. *Aiming Higher: Race, Inequality and Diversity in the Academy*, 38-40.

Bowman, D., McGann, M., Kimberley, H., & Biggs, S. (2016). 'Rusty, invisible and threatening': ageing, capital and employability. *Work, Employment and Society*, Early Online.

Campbell, H. (2000). The glass phallus: Pub (lic) masculinity and drinking in rural New Zealand. *Rural sociology*, 65(4), 562-581.

Christensen, A. D., & Jensen, S. Q. (2014). Combining hegemonic masculinity and intersectionality. *NORMA: International Journal for Masculinity Studies*, 9(1), 60-75.

Collins, P. H. (2015). Intersectionality's definitional dilemmas. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 41, 1-20.

Connell, R. W. (1987). Hegemonic masculinity and emphasized femininity. *Gender and Power: Society, the Person, and Sexual Politics*, 183-88.

Connell RW and Messerschmidt JW (2005) Hegemonic masculinity: Rethinking the concept. *Gender and Society* 19(6): 1–31.

Czarniawska, B., & Sevón, G. (2008). The thin end of the wedge: Foreign women professors as double strangers in academia. *Gender, Work & Organization*, 15(3), 235-287.

Demetriou, D. Z. (2001). Connell's concept of hegemonic masculinity: A critique. *Theory and society*, 30(3), 337-361.

DiAngelo, R. (2018). *White Fragility: Why It's So Hard for White People to Talk About Racism*. London: Beacon Press.

Dy, A. M., Marlow, S., & Martin, L. (2017). A Web of opportunity or the same old story? Women digital entrepreneurs and intersectionality theory. *Human Relations*, 79(3) 286-311.

Fangmeng, T. (2016). Brain circulation, diaspora and scientific progress: A study of the international migration of Chinese scientists, 1998–2006. *Asian and Pacific Migration Journal*, 25(3), 296-319.

Forrest, J., & Dunn, K. (2006). 'Core' Culture Hegemony and Multiculturalism Perceptions of the Privileged Position of Australians with British Backgrounds. *Ethnicities*, 6(2), 203-230.

Hancock, A-M. (2007) When multiplication doesn't equal quick addition: examining intersectionality as a research paradigm, *Perspectives on Politics*, 5(1), 63-79.

Hatchell, H. (2004). Privilege of whiteness: Adolescent male students' resistance to racism in an Australian classroom. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 7(2), 99-114.

Hearn, J., Nordberg, M., Andersson, K., Balkmar, D., Gottzén, L., Klinth, R., ... & Sandberg, L. (2012). Hegemonic masculinity and beyond: 40 years of research in Sweden. *Men and masculinities*, 15(1), 31-55.

HESA (2015) Staff in UK Higher Education Accessed 24th February 2017.
<https://www.hesa.ac.uk/news/26-02-2015/age-and-gender-of-staff>

Husted, L., Nielsen, H. S., Rosholm, M., & Smith, N. (2001). Employment and wage assimilation of male first-generation immigrants in Denmark. *International Journal of Manpower*, 22(1/2), 39-71.

Ifedi, R. (2010). Situating Our Racialized Beings in the Race Talk in the U.S.: African-born Blacks, Our Experience of Racialization, and Some Implications for Education.

Journal of Educational Controversy

5(2) <http://www.wce.wvu.edu/Resources/CEP/eJournal/v005n002/a003.shtml>

Izak, M., Kostera, M., & Zawadzki, M. (Eds.) (2017). *The future of university education*.

Cham, Switzerland: Springer.

Johansson, M. and Sliwa, M. (2014) Gender, foreignness and academia: An intersectional analysis of the experiences of foreign women academics in UK business schools. *Gender, Work and Organization*, 21(1): 18-36.

Johansson, M., & Śliwa, M. (2016). 'It is English and there is no alternative': Intersectionality, language and social/organizational differentiation of Polish migrants in the UK. *Gender, Work and Organization*, 23(3), 296-309.

Kanter, R. M. (2008). Men and women of the corporation: New edition. Basic books.

Katrinli, A., & Penbek, S. (2010). Role of cultural sensitivity on creativity of academic expatriates: The moderating effect of culture. *Afr. J. Bus. Manage*, 4(5), 755-763.

Kimmel, M (2007). *The Gendered Society*. Oxford: OUP

King, N. (2012). Doing template analysis. *Qualitative organizational research: Core methods and current challenges*, 426.

Kunz, S. (2016). Privileged mobilities: Locating the expatriate in migration scholarship. *Geography Compass*, 10(3), 89-101.

Laidley, T. (2013). Climate, class and culture: political issues as cultural signifiers in the US. *The Sociological Review*, 61(1), 153-171.

Lawson, V. A. (1998). Hierarchical households and gendered migration in Latin America: feminist extensions to migration research. *Progress in Human Geography*, 22(1), 39-53.

Leonard, P. (2008). Migrating identities: gender, whiteness and Britishness in post-colonial Hong Kong. *Gender, Place and Culture*, 15(1), 45-60.

Levine-Rasky, C. (2011). Intersectionality theory applied to whiteness and middle-classness. *Social Identities*, 17(2), 239-253.

Liepins, R. (2000). Making men: the construction and representation of agriculture-based masculinities in Australia and New Zealand. *Rural sociology*, 65(4), 605-620.

Mahuteau, S., & Junankar, P. R. (2008). Do migrants get good jobs in Australia? The role of ethnic networks in job search. *Economic Record*, 84(s1), S115-S130.

Mason, D. (2000). *Race and Ethnicity in Modern Britain (2nd ed.)*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

May, R. A. B. (2014). When the methodological shoe is on the other foot: African American interviewer and White interviewees. *Qualitative Sociology*, 37(1), 117-136.

McBride, A., Hebson, G., & Holgate, J. (2015). Intersectionality: are we taking enough notice in the field of work and employment relations? *Work, employment and society*, 29(2), 331-341.

McKenzie, F. H. (2010). Fly-in fly-out: The challenges of transient populations in rural landscapes. In *Demographic change in Australia's rural landscapes* (pp. 353-374). Springer Netherlands.

Ministry of Business, Innovation & Employment (March 2018). *Migration Trends 2016/2017*. Online report, New Zealand government. Retrieved from <https://www.mbie.govt.nz/publications-research/research/migrants---monitoring/migration-trends-2016-17.pdf>

Mooney, S., Ryan, I. and Harris, C., (2017). The Intersections of gender with age and ethnicity in hotel careers: Still the same old privileges? *Gender, Work & Organization*, 24(4), pp.360-375.

Nash, J. C. (2008). Re-thinking intersectionality. *Feminist review*, 89(1), 1-15.

New Zealand Human Rights Commission (2012). Census of women's participation.
<http://www.hrc.co.nz/wp-content/uploads/2012/11/web-census.pdf>

Nicholls, C. (2005). Death by a thousand cuts: Indigenous language bilingual education programmes in the Northern Territory of Australia, 1972–1998. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 8(2-3), 160-177.

Oikelome, F., & Healy, G. (2007). Second-class doctors? The impact of a professional career structure on the employment conditions of overseas-and UK-qualified doctors. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 17(2), 134-154.

Özbilgin M. and Healy, G. (2004) 'The gendered nature of career development of university professors: the case of Turkey'. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 64(2) 358-371.

Probert, B., (2005) 'I Just Couldn't Fit It In: Gender and Unequal Outcomes in Academic Careers'. *Gender, Work and Organization*, 12(1) 50-72.

Ria, Y. (2011). Drawing new boundaries of participation: experiences and strategies of economic citizenship among skilled migrant women in Switzerland. *Environment and Planning A*, 43(7), 1530-1546.

Richardson, J., & McKenna, S. (2002). Leaving and experiencing: why academics expatriate and how they experience expatriation. *Career Development International*, 7(2), 67-78.

Richardson, J., & Zikic, J. (2007). The darker side of an international academic career. *Career Development International*, 12(2), 164-186.

Rodriguez, J. K., & Ridgway, M. (2018). Contextualizing privilege and disadvantage: Lessons from women expatriates in the Middle East. *Organization*. OnlineFirst.

Samaluk, B. (2014). Whiteness, ethnic privilege and migration: A Bourdieuan framework. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 29(4), 370-388.

Sang, K., Al-Dajani, H. and Özbilgin, M. (2013) Frayed careers of migrant female professors in British Academia: An intersectional perspective. *Gender, Work and Organization*, 20(2): 158-171.

Sang, K. J., Dainty, A. R., & Ison, S. G. (2014). Gender in the UK architectural profession:(re) producing and challenging hegemonic masculinity. *Work, Employment and Society*, 28(2), 247-264.

Sang, K. J., Richards, J., & Marks, A. (2016). Gender and Disability in Male-Dominated Occupations: A Social Relational Model. *Gender, Work & Organization*, 23(6), 566-581.

Schech, S. & Haggis, J. (2004). Terrains of migrancy and whiteness: How British migrants locate themselves in Australia', in A. Moreton-Robinson (ed.) *Whitening Race: Essays in Social and Cultural Criticism*, pp. 176–91. Canberra: Aboriginal Studies Press.

Shepherd, J. (2011, 27 May). 14,000 British professors – but only 50 are black. *The Guardian*. Online article. Retrieved from <https://www.theguardian.com/education/2011/may/27/only-50-black-british-professors>

Smithson, J., Lewis, S., Cooper, C., & Dyer, J. (2004). Flexible working and the gender pay gap in the accountancy profession. *Work, Employment & Society*, 18(1), 115-135.

Stahl, G. K., Miller, E. L., & Tung, R. L. (2002). Toward the boundaryless career: A closer look at the expatriate career concept and the perceived implications of an international assignment. *Journal of World Business*, 37(3), 216-227.

Syed, J., & Murray, P. (2009). Combating the English language deficit: The labour market experiences of migrant women in Australia. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 19(4), 413-432.

Tatli, A. and Özbilgin, M. (2012) An Emic Approach to Intersectional Study of Diversity at Work: A Bourdieuan Framing, *International Journal of Management Reviews* 14(2) 180-200.

Van den Brink, M. and Benschop, Y. (2014) Gender in academic networking: The role of gatekeepers in professorial recruitment. *Journal of Management Studies*, 51(3): 460-492.

Wadham, B. A. (2004). *Differentiating whiteness: white Australia, white masculinities and Aboriginal reconciliation*. Aboriginal Studies Press.

Wang, C. C., Andre, K., & Greenwood, K. M. (2015). Chinese students studying at Australian universities with specific reference to nursing students: a narrative literature review. *Nurse Education Today*, 35(4), 609-619.

Warner, L. R. (2008) A best practices guide to intersectional approaches in psychological research. *Sex Roles*, 59 (5-6), 454-463.

Wyatt, M., & Silvester, J. (2015). Reflections on the labyrinth: Investigating black and minority ethnic leaders' career experiences. *Human Relations*, 68(8): 1243 – 1269